UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,932	01/13/2006	Frank Theobald	03/058 LTSBOE	4048
Cathy R Moore	7590 09/01/200	EXAMINER		
Propat		RAO, SAVITHA M		
Charlotte, NC 2	aron Amity Road 8211	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1614		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/564,932	THEOBALD ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	SAVITHA RAO	1614	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	vhich places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(feet) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE c). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI 36(a) and the appropriat	on. LED WITHIN TWC te extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	nally set in the final Office	ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ w);	ΓE below);	
 (c)	corresponding number of finally reje		ne issues for
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,6-12 and 14-18</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been consideration because: 		•	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other: the IDS submitted on 06/26/2009 is not entered sistatement filed fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because it lead the application file, but the information referred to therein has no	nce it is after final submissitiona ar icks a statement as specified in 37		
/Ardin Marschel/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614	/SAVITHA RAO/ Examiner, Art Unit 1614		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

Part of Paper No. 20090817

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended claims 1 submitted on 06/24/2009 adds new limitations that ultimately change claim scope and would require new searching and new rejections. Specifically, the newly added limitations "..disposed on the backing layer..." in line 3-4 of the claim, new limitation of the weight of the active ingredient preamipexol in the proportion of ... "25 to less than 75% by weight....." in lines 7-8 of the claim and new limitation of ".... second active ingredient containing polymer layer disposed on...... by weight" in lines 9-14 of the claim. The amended claim 16 submitted on 06/24/2009 adds new limitation that ultimately changes the claim scope and would require new searching and new rejections. Specifically, the newly added limitations ".. and the pressure sensitive adhesive............ dispersion" in lines 3-4 of claim 16. The amended claim 18 submitted on 06/24/2009 adds new limitation that ultimately changes the claim scope and would require new searching and new rejections. Specifically, the newly added limitations "..and said system has no additional pressure sensitive top plaster" in the last two lines of claim 18.

Claim 18 contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 18 recites "... and said system has no additional pressure sensitive top plaster" in the last two lines of the claim. The disclosure as filed and the noted supposting lines on page 9, paragraph 1 of the "Applicants's arguments and remarks" fails to indicate the absence of the additional pressure sensitive top plaste as claimed in the penultimate and last line of the claim. Accordingly, claim 18 raises new matter issues.

Continuation of 11. Does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amended claims 1 submitted on 06/24/2009 adds new limitations that ultimately change claim scope and would require new searching and new rejections. Specifically, the newly added limitations "..disposed on the backing layer..." in line 3-4 of the claim, new limitation of the weight of the active ingredient preamipexol in the proportion of ... "25 to less than 75% by weight....." in lines 7-8 of the claim and new limitation of ".... second active ingredient containing polymer layer disposed on...... by weight" in lines 9-14 of the claim. The amended claim 16 submitted on 06/24/2009 adds new limitation that ultimately changes the claim scope and would require new searching and new rejections. Specifically, the newly added limitations ".. and the pressure sensitive adhesive......... dispersion" in lines 3-4 of claim 16. The amended claim 18 submitted on 06/24/2009 adds new limitation that ultimately changes the claim scope and would require new searching and new rejections. Specifically, the newly added limitations "..and said system has no additional pressure sensitive top plaster" in the last two lines of claim 18., In addition the newly addes limitations in claim 18 raises new matter issues as noted above.

Applicants arguments in response to the final rejection mailed on 03/02/2009 has been considered but are deemed unpersuasive. Not considering the newly amended claims 1, 16 and 18 set forth in the response of 06/24/2009 it will not be entered into the record, none of the arguments presented by the Applicant has been found to be persuasive because they are directed to the proposed amended claims. The IDS submitted